

LUC-295/Farhang 3-2

10

REMARKS

Claims 25-45 are pending in the application. Claims 25-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 25-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,195,558 issued to Griffith et al. on February 27, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,918,172 issued to Saunders et al. on June 29, 1999, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,526,272 issued to Bansal et al. on February 25, 2003, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,192,234 issued to Chavez, Jr. on February 20, 2001.

Rejection Under Griffith and Saunders

Claims 25-27, 29-33, 35, 38-40, 42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,195,558 issued to Griffith et al. on February 27, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,918,172 issued to Saunders et al. on June 29, 1999.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants assert that even if it were proper to combine the cited references, the resulting combination would not make obvious applicants' claims. This is because neither Griffith nor Saunders teach or suggest applicants' independent claim 25 limitation, as amended, that now recites, "assigning by a controller a permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station, wherein the numbers have fewer than seven digits."

As stated in the Office Action, the Examiner agrees that Griffith does not teach this limitation. Moreover, applicants note that Saunders does not teach this limitation either. Instead, Saunders discloses a communications device that includes a plurality of number assignment modules (NAMs) having a plurality of mobile identification numbers (MINs), as stated in column 5, lines 45-54 and shown in FIG. 1. The MINs are 10 digit numbers as shown in FIG. 2. By contrast, applicants' permanent first and second numbers have fewer than seven digits, as recited by applicants' claim 25. Therefore Saunders is missing the permanent first and second numbers as recited in applicants' claim 25.

Thus, the clear teaching of Saunders is that a controller does not assign a permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station, wherein the numbers have fewer than seven digits.

LUC-295/Farhang 3-2

11

Therefore the combination of Griffith with Saunders does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 25, and therefore claim 25 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 26-27 and 29-30 depend from allowable claim 25, these claims are also allowable.

Independent claims 31 and 38 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 25, which was shown is not taught by the combination of Griffith with Saunders. For example, claim 31 recites, "assigning by a controller of a mobile switching center a permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station, wherein the numbers have fewer than seven digits" and claim 38 recites, "assigning to a mobile station at a location distinct from the mobile station, permanent first and second numbers, the numbers having fewer than seven digits". The combination of Griffith with Saunders does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 31 and 38 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 32-33 and 35 depend from claim 31, and claims 39-40, 42 and 44 depend from claim 38, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under Griffith, Saunders, Bansal, and Chavez, Jr.

Claims 28, 34, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffith in view of Saunders and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,526,272 issued to Bansal et al. on February 25, 2003.

Claims 36 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffith in view of Saunders and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,192,234 issued to Chavez, Jr. on February 20, 2001.

Claim 28 depends from independent claim 25, claim 34 depends from independent claim 31, and claim 41 depends from independent claim 38. As noted hereinabove, the combination of Griffith with Saunders does not teach or suggest the "assigning by a controller a permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station, wherein the numbers have fewer than seven digits", nor does the combination of Griffith with Saunders teach or suggest "assigning by a controller of a mobile switching center a permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station, wherein the numbers have fewer than seven digits", nor does the combination of Griffith with Saunders teach or suggest "assigning to a mobile station at a location distinct from the mobile station, permanent first and second numbers, the numbers having fewer than seven digits", as recited in applicants'

LUC-295/Farhang 3-2

12

independent claims 25, 31, and 38, respectively. Bansal and Chavez, Jr. do not teach or suggest the elements either. Thus, claims 28, 34, 36, 41 and 43 are allowable over the proposed combination under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New Claim

New claim 45 has been added. Claim 45 includes a limitation directed to the type of permanent numbers assigned to the mobile station. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicants' attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: October 12, 2005

Carmen B. Patti & Associates, LLC
Customer Number 47382